DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 434 497 EF 005 614

AUTHOR Hennon, Lisa
TITLE School Architecture, Curriculum, and Pedagogy: Shifts in the Discursive Space of the "School" as Forms of Governmentality.
PUB DATE 1999-04-19
NOTE 20p.
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum; Educational Change; *Educational Facilities Design; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instruction; Public Schools; *Student School Relationship

ABSTRACT

The historical shifts in United States discourses of school architecture as they relate to reforms and inventions of new pedagogical techniques are examined using Michel Foucault's conceptualization of "governmentality" and related scholarship. The purpose is to question assumptions underlying two claims currently being made about school architectural design. The first claim is that the space of the school needs to be more democratic, like a community, and the second is that the space of the school has become more oppressive and controlling. Common school design discourses in the United States incorporated some disciplinary aspects of British monitorial schools. However, in the 1800s, common school discourses governmentalized the "American" school-house with the aim of self-government. Four historical junctures in discourses of school architecture are identified that provide the contingent conditions and reasonings upon which the current debates about reform of school design seem reasonable and make sense. (Contains 65 references.) (GR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 434 497

School Architecture, Curriculum, and Pedagogy: Shifts in the Discursive Space of the 'School' as Forms of Governmentality

by
Lisa Hennon
University of Madison-Wisconsin

Abstract

This paper is a preliminary examination of historical shifts in U.S. discourses of school architecture as they relate to curricular reforms and inventions of new pedagogical techniques. My strategy of discursive analysis uses Michel Foucault's conceptualization of 'governmentality' and related scholarship to examine discourses on school architecture. The purpose is to question assumptions underlying two claims currently being made about school architectural design. The first claim is that the space of the school needs to be more democratic, like a 'community,' and the second claim is that the space of the school has become more oppressive and controlling. I argue that common school design discourses in the U.S. incorporated some disciplinary aspects of British monitorial schools. However, in the 1800s, common school discourses governmentalized the 'American' school-house with the aim of self-government.

There are particular historical junctures in discourses of school architecture that provide the contingent conditions and reasonings upon which the current debates about reform of school design seem reasonable and make sense. Schematically, they are: (1) the common school discourses of the "school-house" during the nineteenth century; (2) the emergence of the "school-plant" along with "planning" discourses in the 1920s and 30s; (3) the "open-plan" in the 1950s that followed as a critique of the "school-plant"; and (4) the enfolding and redeployment of elements of the "school-house," "school-plant" and the "open-plan" in the "school-as-community."

Outline

I. Schools for the 21st Century: Building Community
II. The 'Space' of the School as a Problematic of Self-Government
    A. Governing through community
    B. 'Space' as discursive
    C. 'Space' as an historical-political problematization of population
III. Is There a "Foucault Effect"?
    A. 'Space' is an assumed ontological category
    B. The school-as-community interrupts relations of surveillance
    C. An historical discontinuity between common school discourses and monitorial schools
IV. Governmentalization of the Common School
    A. The monitorial school-room
    B. The 'American' school-house
V. Is a "Flexible Learning Environment" More Free?

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lisa Hennon
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EF 005 614

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

School Architecture, Curriculum, and Pedagogy:
Shifts in the Discursive Space of the 'School' as Forms of Governmentality

I. Schools for the 21st Century: Building Community

With a few exceptions, educational and school design discourses construct the space of the school as the empty repository of good (or bad) intentions gleaned from curricular and pedagogical reform discourses. The current push to realign subject matter, such as an integrated curriculum, is attached to pedagogical reforms (such as team teaching and cooperative learning) to provide appropriate instruction for multiple learning styles, multiple intelligences, developmental stages and disabilities. The push coalesces in an argument to build schools as "flexible learning environments" (Petit, 1997; American School & University, 1998; Langone, 1998; Hood-Smith & Leffingwell, 1983; Steubing 1995).

New floor plans, alone, do not convey the convergence of discursive elements. Building a "flexible learning environment" requires new networks of relations achieved through re-partitioning and re-distributing rooms, staff, students, furniture and media. According to architectural and educational studies of school building and design, a "flexible learning environment" is "interactive" and promotes "active" learning through a sense of "community." As an organizing gesture and for convenience, I characterize current discourses on school architecture as the school-as-community to distinguish it from past conceptualizations, such as the common school-house of the early 1800s and the open-plan school that came into vogue in the 1970s.

The label of school-as-community does not refer to a model because there are currently at least three architectural models through which discourses on flexibility, active learning, and community flow: the "open school," the "pod school" and the "classroom school" (Goldberg, 1991). Each of the models is thought to serve at least some aspects of flexibility and active learning in a school-as-community. Let me briefly describe each model.

The open school has few built-in features; instead, furniture, storage carts and partitions are movable fixtures and modules by which the space quickly and easily can be partitioned and sub-divided into a 'flexible space' of open and enclosed areas to fit the day-to-day changes in student groupings and activities. There are no corridors in the open school; modifiable circulation paths are meant to carry students directly from one activity to another to diminish the amount of 'non-educational' time and to expose students to a variety of opportunities in the school community to actively learn (Moore & Lackney, 1994; see also Pearson, 1975, and Propst, 1972, for earlier articulations of the "open plan").

The pod school is discussed as a way to subdivide large, densely populated schools into smaller and more personal multiple groupings and activities that allow a sense of community to flourish (Goldberg, 1991). Frequently, the arrangements of school space in the pod school are described as a "town" or "community" in which "streets" replace the former "corridor." Rather than efficiently circulating the school population to their proper destinations through hallways, school "streets" are used as common areas to congregate, socialize, and to display student work. Names of "streets" help arrange the school into "neighborhoods" and "home-like" classroom

suites. The intent is "to create an intimate scale that promotes interaction and cooperation amongst students and teachers" (Steubing, 1995, p. 53).

And finally, the classroom school is usually described as the traditional or conventional model in which an administrative center is winged by corridors lined with classrooms of uniform size and orientation. The classroom school is divided into age-grade and subject-matter classifications. Often scorned and despised as the "egg-crate" plan or the "big box," the classroom school remains a viable and valued model for holding a group of children together to form a 'classroom community' in reform discourses of "inclusion," "multi-age" and "mixed-grade" classifications and groupings (Goldberg, 1991; American School & University, 1998; Reisberg, 1998). The problems of using space flexibly to provide for active learning and for promoting community relations beyond the classroom frequently are resolved in discourses of technology in which electronically mediated instruction reorganizes the classroom (e.g., OECD, 1996).

Regardless of contrasting spatial configurations, and regardless of model, some elements of which are used in combination with the other two, the school-as-community is conceptualized as a "flexible learning environment." The overall aim is to promote active participation and learning by providing the physical conditions that foster in students and staff a sense of having a personal stake in the school. The rhetoric of discourses on school building and the space of the school remain either exhortative or technical in the school-as-community. 'Space' in the school-as-community is largely unpoliticized in current discourses, and yet, paradoxically, the space of the school is believed to be endowed with the capacity to realize the many aims of reform.

II. The 'Space' of the School as a Problematic of Self-Government

While the idea of 'community' is not new (see, e.g., Franklin 1986), today there is a sense that the components and dynamics of communal, inclusive, social life are known, can be planned for, must be taught, and ought to be built into the physical environment. School professionals are expected to not only work more closely with the community served by the school, but also to foster "community" relations, to think of the school as a "learning community," and to work to instill a "sense of community" in their students (see, e.g., Annual Urban Conference, 1997). To understand the 'space' of the school-as-community as political, I resituate elements of the above reasoning, first, by suggesting that the community is a current problematic of governing, and second, that the 'space' of the school historically has held a double status as a site of political problematization.

A. The turn to a local and more personal 'community' as a way to frame social issues is not limited to educational discourses. Moreover, the turn to 'community' encompasses rationalities that are not peculiar to any nation, but rather embodies a wider ethos and rationale of government (Dean, 1995; Istance, 1997) The diverse invocations of 'community' signify a reconfiguration of multiple discourses that has lead scholars to ponder the changes occurring in 'governmentality,' that is, changes in the reasonings of diverse expert/technical/practical knowledges (e.g. Barry, Osborne and Rose, 1996). Current appeals to 'community' signal a discursive shift that relocalizes self-government. The site of 'community,' as Nikolas Rose argues, is a discursive space of new moral relations in which individuals have obligations and allegiances to multiple and heterogeneous communities (Rose 1995, 1996). 'Community' becomes a micro point of management of a variety of overlapping networks which are no longer

anchored in the physical space of land nor in the ordered spaces of society. The 'community' in this context becomes a project of political reflection which realigns the capacities and aspirations of the citizen with the aims of government (Popkewitz 1996).

At this point, it is important to sort out different uses of 'space' and 'spatial' metaphors in my argument because it is reasonable to ask: how can 'community' refer to a *discursive space* as well as be a referent for modeling *spatial relations* and architectural design features of schools? The distinctions I make in uses of the word 'space' are meant as analytic tools that enable conceptual linkages that would otherwise be awkward or misconstrued with a unitary notion of 'space.'

B. Recognizing multiple uses of the term 'space' provides a way to flush out meanings that frequently are misrecognized, devalued, or omitted in educational reform discourses. Popkewitz (1997) writes that in current scholarship, metaphors of discourse and texts, as well as geographical concepts of 'maps,' 'discursive fields,' 'regionality,' 'localities,' 'terrain,' 'imagined communities' and 'institutional geographies' are introduced to understand fields of representation. For example, in sociological studies, a notion of 'social space' organizes the analysis of social relations (e.g. Bourdieu, 1992, 1972; Wagner, 1994; and Lash, 1990).

As I conduct an analysis of 'governmentalities,' the use of spatial metaphors are introduced to understand how spatial logics and temporal logics coincide in discursive-practical reasonings. The attention given to space is not a concern solely with a geographical idea of physical location but also as a way to understand the rules and standards of reason through which the subject is "continually 'made' through the formation of social spaces" (Popkewitz, 1997, p. 23). Reference to the 'territory' of government or to the 'site' of community identifies a discursive space in which the citizen as subject is continually made and remade.

A 'discursive space' introduces certain types of questions that entail rethinking ideas of history or progress by making intelligible the ways in which discourses emerge, appropriate from, join with, or alchemize existing discourses into hybrid concepts, individuals, things, techniques, and practices. Discourses of community today differ from earlier investigations in that psychological discourses of multiple intelligences and learning styles have converged with conceptual elements from the earlier part of this century, such as the intimate and personal "primary group." Planning and administrative discourses are redeployed with the 'restructuring' of pedagogical relations and curricular realignment The discursive space of the 'school' refers to the convergence and confluence of multiple discourses that mobilize our reasonings and justifications for educative actions. Therefore, I do not attempt a total inventory and cataloguing of how all schools 'actually' were or are now being built; nor does the analysis entail questions about what classroom practices 'actually' were or are like.[1] Instead, I focus on the fields of representation and the systems of reasoning that inform the design and ordering of the 'school.'

C. Simultaneously, however, I am interested in the ways in which 'space' has been an historical-political problematization of governing through the deployment of the school as a 'built environment' having a 'geographical' location and 'physical' function. A concern for the discursive conditions upon which a notion of a school's functional *physicalness* leads me to a second use of 'space' as a political problematization of the 'school.' A few comments hopefully will help clarify the double status of 'space.'

In current educational scholarship as well as discourses of school architecture, the 'space' of the school is simply equated with geographic concepts of physical location or context, such as ethnographic, psychometric, and affective studies of the child within the context of a school

environment. With the equation of space to physical functions, school designers encounter difficulties in empirically substantiating claims about the impact of different architectural models on measures of student achievement, self-esteem, and social interactions (Duke, 1998).

The very notion of 'physical space' having *a priori* functions and effects should be questioned because the reasoning suggests a non-culturally specific, ahistoric and naturalistic conception, a conception that is contested, for example, by geographers (e.g., Gregory, 1994; Harvey, 1989; see also Kirby, 1996). Nor can we assume that the category of space has held an historically constant discursive home. At the end of the eighteenth century, new conceptualizations in theoretical and experimental physics began to consider a politics of space (see Toulmin, 1990). Investments of political and scientific discursive practices displaced philosophy as the sole orator of space (Foucault, 1980). Physical sciences such as engineering emerged to fill an epistemic gap.[2] The physical and engineering sciences were thought of as too technical and too practical to be considered intellectual or philosophical, and as too remote from social and political reality to be considered political. The engineering sciences had a political *utility* in liberal discourses that eschewed intruding into the daily lives of citizens; physical science discourses were useful to questions of governing because they were perceived as having no political content (Barry, 1996, p. 123).

My purposes for problematizing the naturalistic and functional equation of space as geographic location is to question the elision of political discourses and scientific practices that arose around the questions of governing populations and bodies. More precisely, I question assumptions of geographic location that have enabled liberal governance 'at a distance.' Political and scientific practices have inscribed discursive domains for the problematization of the body in terms of expert and 'practical' discourses such as geography, architecture and engineering to create a self-governing population. The theory-practice binary cannot enunciate the political utility of 'practical' knowledges. I am interested, therefore, in those practices that arose from efforts to act upon our sense of locating our body and our mental and physical individualization.

While I refer to the geographic location and physical arrangements of the school, the school is resituated as one of the historical-political problematizations of population with the aim of citizenship and government. The discursive domain of the 'school' has been and continues to be a political reflection upon how to enclose a specific age-segment of the population and to physically order and relate members of the population in an educative way.

Historical junctures of the school-house or the school-as-community can be read as shifts in practices that I refer to as different forms of governmentality of the 'school.' The discourses of school building and design delineate an area for introducing questions about history, progress, freedom and power in constituting the school as a space of political reason. Asking these questions is important because current assumptions about school architectural design assert that schools either have become increasingly controlling and oppressive, or the belief that if we could simply 'get it right,' then our dreams for social justice and democratic freedom will be realized (in the next century).

III. Is there a "Foucault Effect"? [3]

We build buildings, and then they build us.
--Winston Churchill[4]

Numerous studies in educational research have fruitfully used Foucaultian concepts, such as 'disciplinary power' and its diagram of 'panopticism' to intervene in fields as diverse as educational administration (e.g. Shore & Roberts, 1993) and reading and writing instruction (e.g. Heilker, 1994). For example, Deever (1991) compares tracking practices of "ability grouping" to the prison structure--the "panopticon"-- in which prisoners are in full view of the supervisor but cannot see one another; prisoners are simultaneously individuated and subjected to continuous surveillance. Deever argues that there are parallels between the panopticon and curricular reorganizations that occurred after racial desegregation laws of the 1950s and 1960s. Students, he argues, continue to be locked into an institutionalized racism of internal segregation. Important and timely critiques of school social arrangements, such as Deever's, flow into school architectural discourses as examples of how to make the spatial arrangements of schools more equitable.

Fortunately, these studies have amplified the analyses of schools through their examinations of spatial relations and power. The use of concepts from Foucault's work has launched a multiplicity of sites in which scholars interrogate specific assumptions and intervene in prevailing practices. The emphasis of such research, however, is on how buildings 'build us' and restrict our freedom rather than on the reasonings upon which we base how 'we build buildings.'

As Ian Hunter argues, the ways in which Foucault's work has influenced educational research has mainly been as a supplement to existing 'critical'[5] approaches that conceive of power as repressive and conceive of historical progress as thwarted (Hunter, 1996). Hunter writes that numerous studies have used Foucault's description of the monitorial classroom to enlarge upon accounts of the manner in which "the school allegedly reproduces social relations, by detouring human capacities into the forms required by middle-class hegemony, capitalism, racism, patriarchy and other enemies of complete human development" (1996, p. 144). Frequently, the critical literatures assert that panopticism or disciplinary power work to restrict student empowerment and to undermine the potential for resistance, or that discipline and surveillance are destructive to 'true' learning.

I have no desire to 'discipline' readings and uses of Foucault's work, but I do take exception to disagree with the conclusions when a theoretical opportunity to think and question differently is foreclosed. One of the more notable and useful studies of how school architecture can be politicized has been written by Thomas Markus (1993), *Buildings & Power: Freedom and Control in the Origin of Modern Building Types*. However, the relations of surveillance overshadow other governmental aspects of the space of the school in his argument. About the monitorial model that "reappeared" as the open plan in the 1950s, the argument is made that:

> [The] loosely structured class and activity spaces, articulated but undivided from each other, [were] intended to give flexibility in teaching, activities and timetabling. Without *concrete spatial boundaries*, *surveillance* by head teachers over their colleagues, and by the latter over children, became much *easier*. The corridor, considered a waste--in fact the *freest* and most unprogrammed space--disappeared in a return to monitorial schools where furniture and subtle floor markings were used for structuring space without hindering *visibility* (Markus, 1993, p. 94, my emphasis).

Moreover, the argument continues, despite a rhetoric of flexibility, the current increase in "surveillance" is accompanied by an increase in the amount of "invisible controls" in the form of written records and electronic files so that space for privacy and autonomy is diminished (p. 94).

One way to draw conclusions from the above argument is to agree that concrete spatial boundaries were a hindrance to power, and to agree that power has become not only more subtle and invisible but also that power is more supported by invisible controls. Conclusion: we are less free in the open plan school. I disagree with the conclusion for U.S. schooling practices because there are three problems with the above arguments that append concepts of panopticism and discipline to 'critical' assumptions about power and history. The problems arise from taking space as an ontological and phenomenological category that then transforms panopticism and discipline into essential and transcendental relations of power. The 'concrete space' of buildings is emphasized over the 'building' of space.

A. First, the spatial relations of the built environment take on an ontological status in which it is easy to assume that the effects of power inhere in physical positions (e.g. who can see whom). The physical spatial relations of bodies have been left somewhat at a phenomenological level.[6] In the above analysis of surveillance, *vision* is conflated with *visibility*.[7] Another use of the concept 'visibility' is not as an act of 'seeing'; rather 'visibility' refers to the conditions and practices by which the students and staff as school subjects have come be known, calculated, differentiated, and normalized. Contrary to the claim above, school and work records are not invisible; the electronic dossier must be read by school professionals as part of their decision-making responsibilities. The remark that at one time concrete spatial boundaries made power "visible" whereas power has now gone "invisible" can be read differently: there has been a shift in the presumed functional aspects and reasonings about space and spatial arrangements.

The question might be better stated as: in the current spatial arrangements of the open school, how do the records--which help organize and articulate school practices-- make sense and seem reasonable? Instead of accepting spatial relations as ontological categories, we can turn critical attention to the different visibilities made possible at different junctures of school architecture. The educational record-keeping of the school-plant in the 1950s constructed what could be assessed and known about the student (the visibilities) differently from what currently is assessed and known in recent turns to 'portfolio' assessment (in which students construct and read school records on themselves) or 'running records' of 'development' in the school-as-community (see, e.g., Hammerberg, 1999; and Fendler, for analyses of the different knowledges constituted by the recent forms of recordkeeping).

B. The second problem has to do with assertions about relations of surveillance in the open school model. If I accept the equation of surveillance to 'seeing,' my preliminary review identifies contiguous and concurrent practices that work to obstruct surveillance patterns and disciplinary hierarchies. Continuous visual monitoring ('seeing') of staff and students is impossible in the open school model; nor is unremitting surveillance considered desirable. Partially enclosed reading nooks, play lofts, and office-like cubicles allow students and staff to move in and out of sight. The practice of 'flexible' grouping of students interrupts previous hierarchical practices of the classroom school in which age and subject-matter organized spatial relations. In addition, the open plan dispenses with one of the most vigilantly surveilled areas of the school, the corridor. With the interrupted supervision of the open plan, however, we cannot

assume that 'space' is 'freer.' My point is panoptic relations of the space of the school are discontinuous as they are interrupted by concurrent practices that work against surveillance.

C. A third problem has to do with an historical rupture between common school discourses and monitorial schools. Common school discourses in the U.S. pursued different goals from the monitorial school which had implications for design and organization of the school-room. Similar to the discontinuous relations of power in the school-as-community, there were concurrent and contiguous practices that worked against the monitorial model during the early common school campaigns. Historically, the global circulation of discourses in the 1800s allowed large U.S. city schools to adopt monitorial plans from the British and Foreign School Society, but with significant modification (Barnard, 1848; see also Buenfil, in press for a political-analysis circulating discourses). Theoretically, it is possible that some of the conclusions of the argument put forth by Markus applies to the national context of England, but it's important to note that the problematization of schooling in the U.S. was about universal education that did not single out the working class as an exception (Kaestle, 1983, especially chapter 3; see also, Donald, 1992).

The question of surveillance was very important in discourses of the common school. There were at least two criticisms of the monitorial school-room: first, the military-like task of supervision and maintenance of order was thought to be an egregious waste of time, and secondly, the arrangements for continuous supervision did not address the need to inculcate 'moral character' (Barnard, 1848; Potter and Emerson, 1842). In contrast to training for "blind obedience" in monitorial arrangements of authority, Horace Mann argued that "[o]ne of the highest and most valuable objects, to which the influences of a school can be made conducive, consists in training our children to self-government (excerpted in Cremin, 1957, p. 47).

Reflections upon physical spatial arrangements of the school with the aim of citizenship (as opposed, say, to training for compliance or industrial labor) were explicit in common school discourses. For instance, monitorial schools frequently had sloped floors or built-in platforms so that the school master was positioned to take in at a glance each and every pupil. In 1832, the editorial board of the American Institute of Instruction objected to the practice:

> "*The floor of the room should be level, and not an inclined plane.* Nothing is gained by the common mode of finishing school-rooms with inclined floors; and much is lost in symmetry, convenience and comfort. A faithful and active teacher will be about among his scholars, and not confine himself to a fixed seat, however favorably situated for over-looking them" (Alcott, 1832, p. 51, original emphasis).

A "faithful and active" teacher moving about in the school-room had different 'capacities' and responsibilities (different visibilities) beyond the role as a monitor of order in common school discourses.

Rather than a monolithic notion of 'power' that is deployed in applications of concepts such as 'discipline,' 'panopticism,' or 'surveillance,' we might say that common school discursive practices *governmentalized* the school. The notion of governmentality affords a different registering of practices that are neither reducible one to the other, nor are the practices necessarily harmonious or mutually reinforcing. Moreover, rather than conceiving of historical relations as linear and unidirectional, and therefore, causal, the analytic field of governmentality

offers an opportunity to describe relations of power that are far less fixed or predictable than 'critical' appropriations of 'discipline,' or 'panopticism' have suggested

IV. Governmentalization of the Common School

It may be proper to remind the reader, that by education, we understand a system of training and instruction, which aims at the due culture of all the powers of the soul, both intellectual and moral.

--Alonzo Potter[8]

If we turn attention to practices of 'building a space of relations' rather than to a transcendental and ontological notion of 'spaces building us,' then the field of governmentality provides a number of benefits. Discursive practices of school building and design are contiguous and concurrent; they emanate from multiple directions out of multiple aims, disputes, and strands of discursive practices, each of which have different trajectories and rates. Analyzing the governmental reasonings of such practices provides a way to describe regularities across and within various practices. The regularities are not fixed relations of power but rather, the effects that coalesce at moments of historical juncture. The analysis breaks out of a sense of linear and total history in which inferred causal relations lead to a notion that 'discourse' somehow saturates and binds the space of the school, leaving no room for the 'accidents' of historical relations.

I use the concepts of technologies of power and technologies of the self as a framework for analysis. By technologies of power, I mean the ensemble of actions and practices that organize knowledge with the aim of structuring the field of possibilities in which several ways of behaving, several reactions and diverse comportments may be realized (Foucault, 1978, 1983). We can think of the organization of subject matter, curricular design, pedagogical action, and the organization of pedagogic systems as linking technologies of power to technologies of the self. By technologies of the self, I refer to those techniques by which the individual comes to know the self, the ensemble of actions by which the individual effects self-governing.[9]

In terms of governmentalizing the school, there are three analytic dimensions to compare and contrast the monitorial school to the common school: the goals of learning and the organization of subject matter, an organization that I call the curricular design; the organization of instruction to produce learning, here called the system of pedagogical action; and the basic units and organization of pedagogical action that constitute spatial relations.[10]

A. *The monitorial school-room:*

In the monitorial school room, up to a thousand students were housed under the supervision of student monitors and the school master (Markus, 1993). The goal of the monitorial schools was to form 'good habits,' such as punctuality, proper posture, and standardized body movements. Psychological discourses defined the brain as having different moral and intellectual domains called 'faculties.' By exercising the different faculties, under the regimen of the monitorial school, the performance became habitual and rote (Hamilton, 1989).

The curricular design consisted in enumerating a sequence of behaviorally monitored tasks which required three main organizational features in the school-room. First, long writing tables or desks were lined up in a battalion of rows. Secondly, there were recitation circles, sometimes called "draft stations" along the side walls. And finally, since it was impossible to provide books for each student, "lesson-sheets" were posted on the "standard" pole at the end of

each row or on the walls. The "lesson-sheets" provided the visual models which were to be copied and memorized by the students. The subject-matter to be learned, and the separate steps in the sequence were class-ified. Students were grouped according to "class" or "standard" which referred both to the place in the behavioral sequence of tasks and to physical placement in the room (Seaborne, 1971).

The system of pedagogical action in the monitorial school can be characterized as 'command-driven.' The monitor stood at the end of the row, gave the command, and the students in each row were expected to execute the task in unison. With a quick glance, the monitor checked the work and proceeded to the next command. Once a student completed all the tasks of one 'class' he or she was moved to the next 'class' in the sequence.[11] For example, in writing instruction, one class was at sand-desks tracing letters; another class sat at long tables writing one-syllable letter sequences on slates; still another class worked on two-syllable sequences or worked on writing whole words, while the next class filled out copy-books. If the lesson was a lecture or recitation, the students, by class, stood at attention or recited in unison. Reading, mathematics, moral recitations, recitations of natural laws or memorized historical narratives were arranged so that upon 'command' students performed the behaviors that constituted learning and demonstrated what they had learned.

The monitorial method of schooling can be summarized as having a curricular design of subdividing a subject area into minute behavioral sequences called classes. The system of pedagogic action was organized as command-response. Since students moved through the curricular sequence individually, there was no notion of promoting an entire 'class,' in unison, to the next class. The basic unit that organized a system of pedagogical action was the class and the school-room was the basic organizational unit in which students moved systematically through the sequence of classes.

In a remarkable ensemble of organization, design, and action, up to a thousand pupils were ushered through schooling and into an industrializing world. While the ground of governing discourses shifted beneath their feet, social and educational reformers began to object that the monitorial model didn't work. The shift in discourses registers the incompleteness and mobility of relations of power even as the effects of power are deposited in stone, wood, paper, and iron. Both in England (see e.g. Donald, 1992) and in the U.S., the assumptions and goals of the monitorial schools were rejected. Common school discourses in the U.S. adopted some elements of disciplinary practices, such as the individualizing of pupils in terms of rows of desks or tables, but the discourses mobilized different techniques of the self.

B. *The 'American' school-house:*[12]

Common school discourses on school-house design differed from the monitorial school-room in terms of the goals and organization of the curriculum, and in the system and unit of pedagogical action, whereas the basic organizational unit--the room--stayed the same. The aim of common schooling, as stated earlier, was to produce virtuous, self-governing citizens. The design of the curriculum was intended to inculcate 'understanding' and 'moral character' rather than memorization and scholarly recitation. Discursively, faculty psychology was theorized in combination with moral philosophy, so that intellectual powers, habits of thinking, judging, reasoning, and communication were emphasized (Hamilton, 1989, p. 87). The student "must be instructed by reflection on the operations of his own mind" (Potter & Emerson, 1842).

Beyond some of the rudimentary goals of common schooling, there is little similarity among the vast variety of schools in operation in the early 1800s. However, in discourses of common school reform designs, the reform goal to improve common schools was to develop more uniform practices by disseminating architectural plans, holding public lectures, and providing educational manuals to every district and school.

The design of the curriculum was similar to the monitorial method in that there was believed to be a proper sequence to instruction of the different subjects. In contrast, to fully develop the faculties required a subdivision of knowledge rather than a subdivision of prescribed behavioral performance. Pedagogical organization was difficult because 'class' referred to the specific books that students brought with them to school.[13] A teacher might be responsible for as many as fifty or sixty 'classes' which led to the impossible obligation to purchase and study a copy of each school book, and the even more impossible task of hearing fifty or sixty individual recitations. As an historical and political problematization of population, reform discourses recommended the adoption of 'appropriate' school texts that could be arranged in a series to consolidate the number of classes (Mann, in Filler, 1965).

The ways in which common school instruction differed greatly from monitorial methods was in the pedagogical system. Common school reformers advocated an interrogatory-conversational pedagogy to go beyond the limited information taught with the monitorial command-driven system. "A teacher well versed in the better modes of instruction, which are beginning to be adopted, will, in most branches, teach *each one*, of a class of twenty, more in the same time than he could teach any one individual of the same class" (Mann, in Filler, 1965, p. 68, my emphasis). In order to 'inculcate understanding' in many students of a class at the same time, the teacher was urged to engage in conversation about the subject matter with the student and to "lead him [sic] to ask, as well as answer, questions; and be careful not to let your own words lose their animation, and become mere lecturing" (Potter & Emerson, 1842).

The interrogatory-conversation lesson for several pupils was illustrated by Emerson in the following manner. To exemplify the benefits of conversational and questioning techniques, he chose one of the more difficult geography lessons stated as this axiom: "The annual revolution of the earth round the sun, in connexion with the obliquity of the ecliptic, occasions the succession of the four seasons" (Potter & Emerson, 1842, pp. 408-409). The practice of having students memorize and recite natural laws was interrupted by the import of Pestalozzian pedagogical strategies. Emerson emphasized the importance of using simple conversational language with which the students were already acquainted. He described the beginning of the lesson like this:

> What are the seasons?" you [the teacher] may ask. "All who know may hold up their hands." All hands are up. Some individual is told to answer, and says, "Spring, Summer, Autumn, and Winter." What is meant by the succession of the seasons?" [An individual is called upon] "First comes Spring; then Summer; then Autumn; then Winter." "What is the difference in the seasons?" [Another individual is called upon.] "In Summer it is very hot." "And what is it in Autumn?" (Potter & Emerson, 1842, pp. 408-409).

Emerson then goes on to explain how to requestion students over a succession of days to establish remembrance and "understanding."

In the above example, the basic pedagogic unit was the individual student. Simultaneous instruction of twenty individuals did not necessarily require that all members of a class respond in unison; rather, in a reasoning about faculty psychology and a moral philosophy that of moral faculties of "sympathy" and "emulation," teachers could achieve better results for social improvement (Hamilton, 1989). The emphasis of pedagogic action became gaining and holding the simultaneous attention of all pupils through a system of teacher questioning. Individual answers given by students provided a 'simultaneous' answer for those who remained 'silent' so that all listened and learned.

Grouping students in classes for study, recitation, and simultaneous instruction required new organizational methods. Common school discourses adopted aspects of popular schools in Germany. The *Facher* system divided up multi-room schools into subject areas in which a teacher for each room conducted lectures and recitations in one subject matter, (Potter & Emerson, 1842; see also Barnard, 1848). However, there were three criticisms of the 'appropriateness' of the *Facher* system for 'America': sparsely populated country districts in the U.S. could not support more than one teacher, and while larger towns could support the system, a more important argument was made against dividing up subject matter amongst different teachers: "the sub-masters [teachers] will feel too little responsibility for the moral culture of their pupils" and more importantly, congregating too many students in the *Facher* system would multiply the "dangerous temptations to which they are exposed" (Potter & Emerson, 1842, p. 224).

Populational reasoning in common school discourses had to do with population densities and the effects on "moral culture." Two-room schools were built, sometimes to separate older from younger students, sometimes to separate reading and writing instruction (Hamilton, 1989). One-room or two-room school-houses were more prevalent. In districts that could afford two teachers, male teachers instructed older students and female teachers instructed younger pupils with the underlying reasoning that young and virtuous women were morally attuned to observing and cultivating character (see, e.g., Alcott1832).

In common school discourses as well as the monitorial school, the basic organizational unit for pedagogic action was the school-room that housed numerous classes. The basic pedagogical unit, unlike monitorial methods, however, was the individual student. There are two implications for understanding how the common school was 'governmentalized.' First, in addition to modifying disciplinary and supervisory relations, there was a shift in the system of pedagogical actions to be exercised on the individual (simultaneously and singly) instead of the class.

Secondly, the shift gave the "self" of the student a revised visibility. In emphasizing "understanding" and "interest", the teacher was to study how self-cultivation occurred and in turn, to teach the student to reflect

> on the *operations of his own mind*, on the action of his own *affections* and *propensities*. This is the most important part of the study [of self-cultivation] . . . . [W]e must be able to look into their character, or, since that cannot be done, we must take advantage of the conclusions to which they have come from *the study of their own character* (Potter & Emerson, 1848, p. 274, my emphasis).

An interrogatory-conversational pedagogical system constituted intellectual and moral capacities of the "soul" that could only occur through 'self-cultivating' character, through reflection upon the 'affections' and 'propensities' of the self. In contrast to monitorial training for prescribed and productive self-comportment, common school discourses articulated a curricular and pedagogical system for self-government.

Technologies of power and technologies of the self join the ensembles of surveillance and discipline to strategies of questioning and conversing, to techniques of reflecting upon one's self, to studying the self for understanding, affections, propensities and for assessing one's character. Foucault described modern governmental rationalities as the coupling of 'city-game' and 'shepherd-game' in techniques of pastoral power that simultaneously encompassed the total population and was localized in the individual soul (Burchell, Gordon, & Miller, p. 8). The reasoning that governed common school discourses did not originate with the reformers, but rather, the rationalities, practices, and techniques emanated from multiple sources, from multiple knowledges, architectural designs, and organizational strategies. The historical-political problematizations in common school discourses built the school-house as a governmentalized space.

V. Is a "Flexible Learning Environment" More Free?

To close my discussion, I recall the arguments I have made to speculate on the question of whether a "flexible learning environment" in current school design discourses is a 'freer' 'space.' I began by resituating the deployment of 'community' as a problematic for government. Current scholars have noted changes in the ways in which population is now being problematized. The turn to 'local', 'personal' community relations can be thought of as the discursive territory where questions of government and population meet. The devolving of relations of security and social welfare has emphasized an *active* society in which the responsibility for taking charge of one's destiny is localized in the individual (Dean, 1995). A concurrent shift away from the ordered social relations at the beginning of this century has been described as a de-differentiation of social categories of identity in which the responsibility for creating one's own social trajectory is localized in the individual (e.g. Wagner, 1994; Lash, 1990).

In one sense, a 'flexible learning environment' enunciates the discursive shifts in the design of school buildings. Claims that power has increased, along with claims that rigid sets of relations of the classroom school has disarmed central decision-making and has given the inhabitants of the school more freedom to rearrange pedagogical action, rely upon endowing the space of the school as ontologically functional. The space of the school as the effect of 'building a space of educative relations' undermines both claims by suggesting that power doesn't reside in 'concrete spatial boundaries,' but nor can we ignore the political utility of expert/technical/practical knowledges that go into the design of school buildings. The binary of theory-practice obscures the political utility of 'practice' and 'practical knowledge' in which we don't recognize practices as having political effects.

In another sense, a 'flexible learning environment' encompasses the political utility of such practices as a different form of governmentality. Early common school discourses incorporated relations of discipline and surveillance as they were coupled with pastoral relations of power. Government 'at a distance' protected the individual from state intervention and coercion while at the same moment, localized the effects of power in the 'soul' and made

government a project of the individual. By the 1920s, however, the discursive ground of governing had shifted, releasing rationalities, techniques, and practices into a centrifuge of school-plant building.

Using a governmental field of analysis registers the ways in which practices were neither reducible one to the other, nor were the practices necessarily harmonious or mutually reinforcing. Relations of power are far less fixed and predictable. The analysis breaks out of a sense of linear and total history in which inferred causal relations lead to a notion that 'discourse' somehow saturates and binds the space of the school, leaving no room for the 'accidents' of history. Thus, the recent descriptions of "flexible," "active," and "de-differentiation" of social relations can be read as a relocalization of the effects of power. "Freedom," in this sense, traverses the same terrain as power. The effect of this recognition, then, is to ask: how are we made 'free' (and not 'free') differently in the discourses of school-as-community? Power remains 'invisible' in the assumptions we bring to the questions we ask, including my own, about the 'space' of the school and how we build it.

References

Alcott, William A. 1832. *Essay of the Construction of School-Houses, to which was awarded the prize offered by the American Institute of Instruction.* Boston: Hilliard, Gray, Little and Wilkins & Richardson, Lord and Holbrook.

Barnard, Henry. 1848. *School architecture; or contributions to the improvement of school-houses in the United States.* New Yor: A.S. Barnes & Co. Cincinnati: H.W. Derby & Co.

Barry, Andrew. 1996. Lines of communication and spaces of rule. In Barry, Osborne & Rose (Eds.) *Foucault and political reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government.* The University of Chicago Press.

Barry, Andrew, Thomas Osborne and Nikolas Rose (Eds.). 1996. *Foucault and political reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government.* The University of Chicago Press.

Boston Committee on School-Houses. 1891. Report of the Committee on School-Houses on the subject of school-house sites and new school buildings. Boston: Rockwell and Churchill, City Printers.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Loic J.D. Wacquant. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology.* Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1972. *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* Richard Nice (Trans.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Buenfil, Rosa. In press. Globalization, education and discourse political analysis: ambiguity and accountability in research. *Qualitative studies in education.* Accepted November 24, 1998.

Burchell, Graham, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller (Eds.). 1991. *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality with two lecture by and an interview with Michel Foucault.* University of Chicago Press.

Crary, Jonathan. 1993. *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century.* Cambridge & London: MIT Press.

Dean, Mitchell. 1995. Governing the unemployed self in an active society. *Economy and Society.* Vol. 24, No. 4, (pp. 559-583).

Deever, Bryan. 1991. The panopticon of tracking: Desegregtion and curriculum change in a southern school, 1968-1972. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Study of Curriculum History (Chicago, IL, April 2, 1991).

Deleuze, Giles. 1992. Postscript on the societies of control. *October 59.* Winter. MIT Press.

----- 1988. *Foucault.* Sean Hand (Trans.), Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Donald, James. 1992. *Sentimental education: Schooling, popular culture and the regulation of liberty.* London & new York: Verso.

Duke, Daniel. 1998. Does it matter where our children learn? *White Paper presented at an Invitational Meeting, Washington DC, February 18, 1998.* Eric: ed418578.

Fendler, Lynn. 1998. What is it impossible to think? A genealogy of the educated subject. In Thomas Popkewitz and Marie Brennan (Eds.) *Foucault's challenge: Discourse, knowledge, and power in education.* New York & London: Teachers College Press.

-----PhD Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, chapter 4.

Filler, Louis (ed.). 1965. *Horace Mann on the crisis in education.* Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antioch Press.

Flynn, Thomas. 1994. Foucault's mapping of history. In Gary Gutting (Ed.) *The Cambridge companion to Foucault.* New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 29-46.

Foucault, Michel. 1994. *Aesthetics, method, and epistemology: Essential works of Foucault 1954-1984.* Volume Two. James D. Faubion (Ed.). New York: The New Press.

-----1991. Governmentality. In Burchell, Gordon & Miller (Eds.) *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality, with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault.* The University of Chicago Press.

-----1988. Technologies of the Self. In Martin, Gutman & Hutton (Eds.). *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault.* Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press.

-----1983. Afterword: The subject and power. In Dreyfus & Rabinow (Eds.) *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics.* Second Edition. The University of Chicago Press.

-----1984. Space, knowledge, and power. In P. Rabinow (Ed.) *The Foucault Reader.* New York: Pantheon Books, pp. 239-256.

-----1980. *Power knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977.* C. Gordon (Ed.). New York: Pantheon Books.

-----1978. *The history of sexuality: An introduction.* New York: Vintage Books.

-----1977 [1979]. *Discipline & punish: The Birth of the Prison.* Alan Sheridan (Trans.) New York: Vintage Books.

Franklin, Barry. 1986. *Building the American community: The school curriculum and the search for social control.* London & Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Goldberg, Bruce (Ed.) 1991. Redesigning schools: architecture and school restructuring. *American Federation of Teachers.* Washington, DC. Center for Restructuring. Eric: ed334666.

Gregory, Derek. 1994. *Geographical Imaginations.* Cambrige & Oxford: Blackwell.

Hamilton, David. 1989. *Towards a Theory of Schooling.* New York, London, Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Hammerberg, Dawnene. 1999. Autopoiesis and histories of literacy: Contemporary educational practices as whirligigs of the past. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, April.

Harvey, David. 1989. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change.* Cambridge & Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Heilker, Paul. 1994. "Discipline and punish" and process paradigms (or Foucault, visibility, (dis)empowerment, and the construction of composition studies). *Composition studies Freshman English news.* Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 4-13.

Hood-Smith, Nancy E. and R. Jon Leffingwell. 1983. The impact of physical space alteration on disruptive classroom behavior: a case study. *Education.* Winter, Vol. 104, pp. 224-30.

Kaestle, Carl. 1983. *Pillars of the republic: Common schools and American society, 1780-1860.* New York: Hill and Wang.

Langone, John. 1998. *Focus on exceptional children*, Vol. 30, No. 8.

Lash, Scott. 1990. *Sociology of Postmodernism.* New York & London: Routledge.

Mann, Horace. 1845. *Ninth annual report.* In Lawrence A. Cremin (Ed.), 1957, *The republic and the school. Horace Mann on the education of free men.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University: Bureau of Publications.

Markus, Thomas A. 1993. *Buildings & Power: Freedom & Control in the Origin of Modern Building Types.* London & New York: Routledge.

Meinig, Donald W. 1986. *The Shaping of America: A geographical perspective on 500 years of history. Volume 1, Atlantic America, 1492-1800.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

------1993. *The Shaping of America: A geographical perspective on 500 years of history. Volume 2, Continental America, 1800-1867.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Moore, Gary & Lackney, Jeffery. 1994. Educational facilities for the twenty-first century: Research analysis and design patterns. Center for Architecutre and Urban Planning Research, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee. Eric: ed375514.

-----1993. Design patterns for American schools: Responding to the reform movement. Eric: ed375515.

OECD. 1996. *Schools for Today and Tomorrow, An International Compendium of Exemplary Educational Facilities.* Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Paris, France: Head of Publications Service, OECD.

Owen, David. 1995. Genealogy as exemplary critique: reflections on Foucault and the imagination of the political. *Economy and society.* Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 489-506.

Pearson, Eric. 1975. *School Building and Educational Change.* Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Paris: Director of Information.

Pettit, Jon. 1997. Flexing with the times. *American school & university.* Vol. 69, No. 12, pp. 87-90.

Popkewitz, Thomas. S. 1996. The Administration of freedom: The redemptive culture of the educational sciences. Paper prepared for an international seminar on educational policy at The Catholic University, Sao Paulo, Brazil, September 2-3.

-----1998. *Struggling for the soul: The politics of schooling and the construction of the teacher.* New York & London: Teachers College, Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

------ 1997. A changing terrain of knowledge and power: A social epistemology of educational research. *Educational researcher*, Vol. 26, No. 9, pp. 18-29.

Potter, Alonzo and Emerson, George B. 1842. *The School and the Schoolmaster: A Manual for the use of Teachers, Employers, Trutees, Inspectors, &c., &c., of Common Schools. In two parts.* New York: Harper & Brothers.

Propst, Robert. 1972. *High school: The process and the place.* Ruth Weinstock (Ed.) A Report from Educational Facilities Laboratories.

Reisberg, Leon. 1998. Facilitating *inclusion* with integrated curriculum: A multidisciplinary approach. *Intervention in school & clinic*, Vol. 33, No. 5, pp 272 to 277.

Rose, Nikolas. 1996a. Governing "advanced" liberal democracies. In A. Barry, T. Osborne and N. Rose (Eds.) *Foucault and political reason: liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 37-64.

-----1996b. Governing enterprising individuals. *Inventing our selves: Psychology, power, and personhood.* New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, pp. 150-168.

-----1995. The death of the social? Re-figuring the territory of government. Manuscript for *Economy and society*, special issue: Radically rethinking regulations.

Seaborne, Malcolm. 1971. *The English School: Its architecture and organization 1370-1870.*London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Shore, Cris and Stephen Roberts. 1993. Higher education and the panopticon paradigm: Quality assessment as "disciplinary technology." Paper presented at the Society for Research into Higher Education Conference (Brighton, England).

Stuebing, Susan. 1995. *Redefining the place to learn.* Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Paris, France: head of Publications Service, OECD.

Toulmin, Stephen. 1990. *Cosmopolis: The hidden agenda of modernity.* Chicago University Press.

Van Slyck, Abigail A. 1996. The lady and the library loafer: Gender and public space in Victorian America. *Winterthur portfolios.* Vol. 31, No. 4. Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum, Inc.

Wagner, Peter. 1994. *A sociology of modernity.* London & New York: Routledge.

Waltenspuhl, Paul. 1994. Team teaching and didactically defined spaces in school architecture: The triadic system applied to education. *Educational media international.* Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 128-129. Eric# ej488322.

Endnotes

[1] It is important to acknowledge that geographically, discourses of the common school during the 1800s emerged primarily from the northern and eastern tiers of the U.S. This is due partly to the settlement patterns and demographic shifts leading up to the American Civil War (see, e.g., Meinig, 1986, 1993). More importantly, I read the discourses as articulating local and particular practices as the universal principles of schooling as a means for promoting 'self-government,' universalized principles which continue to govern reasoning about schools.

[2] See Flynn (1994) for a discussion of 'epistemic' formation.

[3] My question refers to the title of an edited collection of studies that include some of Foucault's lectures on governmentality that extend the concept of governmentality as an analytic field (see Burchell, Gordon, and Miller, 1991). I am playing with the title to indicate the 'other' effects, as well, that have lead to the essentialization of some of Foucault's concepts, such as his deployment of Jeremy Bentham's "panopticon" as a diagram of a disciplinary society.

[4]Quote attributed to Churchill by Bruce Goldberg (Ed.) of Redesigning Schools: Architecture and School Restructuring. *Radius.* Vol. 3, No. 1, April-May 1991, pp. 2-16.

[5] I make a distinction between an exemplary critique, such as Foucault's deployment of "panopticism" to identify a modality of power, and a normative critique which seeks an authoritative ground upon which to evaluate and legislate practices and modes of freedom (Owen, 1995).

[6] It is precisely the phenomenological assumptions about eye-sight that Jonathan Crary denaturalizes and historicizes in *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century*, 1993. With regard to architectural discourses, Foucault cautions against a kind of technical determinism in assumptions about architecture in which the model is believed to mirror relations of power (1984, p. 255).

[7] Deleuze provides a helpful elaboration on "visibility." He writes, "[V]isibilities are neither the acts of a seeing subject nor the data of a visual meaning . . . . Visibilities are not defined by sight but are complexes of actions and passions, actions and reactions, multisensorial complexes" (Deleuze, 1988, pp. 58-59).

[8]*The School and the Schoolmaster,* 1844, p. 91.

[9] Fendler (1998) applies and extends the analysis of technologies of power and technologies of the self through curricular design and systems of pedagogic action, which I have adapted for my analysis of school building design.

[10] Since it is the monitorial school that animates current reform and critical arguments, I focus on the monitorial model to contrast it to the common school. Other schools, such as gallery school-rooms, infant schools, and mutual methods were in operation (Barnard, 1848). Seaborne (1971) and Hamilton (1989) give detailed analyses of the different curricular and pedagogical practices among the variety of schools in the early 1800s.

[11] Boys and girls sat on different sides of the rooms; the curriculum bifurcated at 'higher' classes. While very important, the gendered organization of schooling is beyond the scope of this paper. See Abigail Van Slyck's (1996) study of gender and library architecture of the late 1800s.

[12] We should read 'school-house' and 'school-room' in common school discourses of the 1830s to the 1890s as nearly synonymous, for "commons schools" could discursively refer to diverse structures such as sheds, barns, abandoned mills, old alms houses, a room or flat in a city building, and to free-standing, purpose-built 'houses' in the country districts. In 1891, a school

was located in the upper storey of a police court in which students shared the same entryway with prisoners (Boston Committee on School-Houses, 1891).

[13] Pedagogical organization wasn't just a problem of organizing the various subject-matters. There were also different publications. In reference to the problem of too many "class-books," Potter writes that in one state study, there "were *more than two hundred different schoolbooks"* for spelling, reading, arithmetic, geography, history, grammar, natural philosophy, and "other branches" (Potter & Emerson, 1848, pp. 228-229, original emphasis).